

Renormalization in conformal quantum mechanics

Horacio E. Camblong^a and Carlos R. Ordóñez^{b,c}

^a *Department of Physics, University of San Francisco,
San Francisco, California 94117-1080, USA*

^b *Department of Physics, University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77204-5506, USA*

^c *World Laboratory Center for Pan-American Collaboration in Science and Technology,
University of Houston Center, Houston, Texas 77204-5506, USA*

Abstract

The singular behavior of conformal interactions is examined within a comparative analysis of renormalization frameworks. The *effective* approach—inspired by the effective-field theory program—and its connection with the core framework are highlighted. Applications include black-hole thermodynamics, molecular dipole-bound anions, the Efimov effect, and various regimes of QED.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Gh, 11.30.Qc, 11.25.Hf, 04.70.Dy

E-mail addresses: camblong@usfca.edu (H.E. Camblong), ordonez@uh.edu (C.R. Ordóñez)

1. Introduction

Conformal quantum mechanics is based upon the class of Lagrangians whose action is invariant under translations, dilations, and special conformal transformations in time [1, 2]. The interaction potential $V(\mathbf{r})$, associated with the Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + V(\mathbf{r}) , \quad (1)$$

is homogeneous of degree -2 [3] and generates the $\text{SO}(2,1)$ *conformal algebra* [4]

$$[D, H] = -i\hbar H , \quad [K, H] = -2i\hbar D , \quad [D, K] = i\hbar K , \quad (2)$$

which involves the dilation operator

$$D = tH - \frac{\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r}}{4}$$

and the special conformal operator

$$K = t^2 H - \frac{t(\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{p})}{2} + \frac{mr^2}{2} .$$

Systems of this kind are singular and ill-defined for a sufficiently *strong coupling*, as a corollary of the existence of scale symmetry [3] and no further quantum-mechanical analysis appears to be acceptable. However, an alternative viewpoint is possible: the singular behavior of the conformal interaction reveals the existence of additional *ultraviolet physics*, just like in quantum field theory. This *renormalization interpretation*, first discussed for the two-dimensional contact interaction [5, 6, 7], was extended to higher dimensions and to other interactions [8]. In this procedure, detailed knowledge of the short-distances physics is not needed but it is possible to answer well-posed questions for the original problem by the use of regularization and renormalization. In essence, these tools permit a consistent and physically transparent analysis of *singular quantum mechanics*.

In this Letter, we consider the long-range representative of conformal quantum mechanics in its spherically symmetric form. This interaction is considerably more pathological than the contact potential and has subtler renormalization properties, which we investigate by: (i) developing the renormalization frameworks within a *unified approach*, with a real-space regularization procedure; (ii) highlighting a novel effective framework that captures the *universal predictions* for fixed long-distance physics; (iii) illustrating this generic toolbox for several *physical realizations*.

2. Real-space regularization

Our Letter is based on a renormalization procedure in real space for singular interactions, within the philosophy of the *effective-field theory program* [9]. This is justified by the effective nature of any physical description of a system for which the ultraviolet physics is replaced over length scales $r \lesssim a$. Correspondingly, the ensuing effective theory has predictability in the realm of energies of magnitude $|E| \ll \mathcal{E}_a \equiv \hbar^2/2ma^2$, defining a conformal domain (possibly limited by the onset of infrared physics).

The real-space regularization procedure involves a regulator a and a “regularizing core” $V^{(<)}(\mathbf{r})$ that, over scales $r \lesssim a$, replaces the singular potential, while its functional form is only retained in the exterior region [10]: $V(\mathbf{r}) \equiv V^{(>)}(\mathbf{r})$. The regularizing core can be parametrized with a dimensionless function $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r})$, in the form

$$V^{(<)}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \mathcal{V}^{(<)}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\aleph}{a^2} \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r}) , \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r}) \geq 0$ is normalized with

$$\max_{\mathbf{r} \in [0, a]} [\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r})] = 1 ,$$

so that $\aleph$ measures its dimensionless depth. In the exterior region, the singular conformal potential $V(\mathbf{r}) = -g/r^2$ yields

$$V^{(>)}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \mathcal{V}^{(>)}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\lambda}{r^2} \quad (4)$$

(where $\lambda = 2mg/\hbar^2$). Moreover, this treatment can be generalized to the anisotropic inverse square potential [11], e.g., in molecular physics [12].

As a first step, we consider the d -dimensional effective radial Schrödinger equation

$$\left[\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + k^2 - \frac{(l + \nu)^2 - 1/4}{r^2} - \mathcal{V}(r) \right] u(r) = 0 , \quad (5)$$

where $\nu = d/2 - 1$ and $\Psi(\mathbf{r}) = Y_{lm}(\mathbf{\Omega}) u(r)/r^{\nu+1/2}$ is the full-fledged separable solution, in which $Y_{lm}(\mathbf{\Omega})$ stands for the ultraspherical harmonics on S^{d-1} [13].

For the bound-state sector, the criterion of square integrability provides the solution

$$u^{(>)}(r) = A_{l,\nu} \sqrt{r} K_{i\Theta}(\kappa r) , \quad (6)$$

for $r > a$ and energy $E = -\hbar^2 \kappa^2 / 2m < 0$, in terms of the Macdonald function [14] $K_{i\Theta}(z)$ of imaginary order defined from the *conformal coupling* λ through a *conformal parameter*

$$\Theta = \sqrt{\lambda - (l + \nu)^2} . \quad (7)$$

In particular, Eq. (7) leads to the definition of the critical coupling

$$\lambda^{(*)} = (l + \nu)^2 . \quad (8)$$

For the strong-coupling regime, $\lambda \geq \lambda^{(*)}$, Eq. (6) gives the oscillatory behavior [15, 16]

$$u^{(>)}(r) \stackrel{(a < r \sim 0)}{=} -A_{l,\nu} \sqrt{r} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\Theta \sinh(\pi\Theta)}} \sin \left\{ \Theta \left[\ln \left(\frac{\kappa r}{2} \right) + \gamma_\Theta \right] \right\} [1 + O([kr]^2)] \quad (9)$$

near the origin, where

$$\gamma_\Theta = - \{ \text{phase} [\Gamma(1 + i\Theta)] \} / \Theta$$

generalizes the Euler-Mascheroni constant, to which it reduces in the limit $\Theta \rightarrow 0$.

Furthermore, when a regularizing core is considered, the interior solution (for $r < a$)

$$u^{(<)}(r) = B_{l,\nu} \sqrt{r} w_{l+\nu}(\tilde{k}r; \tilde{k}) \quad (10)$$

satisfies the regular boundary condition at the origin; here, $\tilde{k}$ is implicitly defined from

$$(\tilde{k}a)^2 + (\kappa a)^2 = \aleph , \quad (11)$$

while $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r})$ and $w_{l+\nu}$ may depend upon additional parameters. The central equation is

$$\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\tilde{k}a; \tilde{k}) = \mathcal{L}^{(>)}(\kappa a) , \quad (12)$$

which describes, for the reduced wave functions

$$v(r) = \frac{u(r)}{\sqrt{r}} = \begin{cases} v^{(<)}(r) \propto w_{l+\nu}(\tilde{k}r; \tilde{k}) & \text{for } r < a \\ v^{(>)}(\kappa r) \propto K_{i\Theta}(\kappa r) & \text{for } r > a \end{cases} , \quad (13)$$

the continuity of the logarithmic derivatives

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv \frac{d \ln v(r)}{d \ln r} . \quad (14)$$

Equation (12) is further supplemented by the continuity of the wave function,

$$B_{l,\nu} w_{l+\nu}(\tilde{k}a; \tilde{k}) = A_{l,\nu} K_{i\Theta}(\kappa a) . \quad (15)$$

From Eqs. (9) and (11), the fundamental condition (12) reduces to the form

$$\cot [\alpha (\Theta, \kappa a)] \stackrel{(\kappa a \ll 1)}{\sim} \frac{1}{\Theta} \mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph) , \quad (16)$$

where

$$\alpha (\Theta, \kappa a) \equiv \Theta \left[\ln \left(\frac{\kappa a}{2} \right) + \gamma_\Theta \right] \quad (17)$$

and, *by abuse of notation*, we define $\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph)$ through the limit

$$\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\tilde{k}a; \tilde{k}) \stackrel{(\kappa a \ll 1)}{\sim} \mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\sqrt{\aleph}; \tilde{k}) \equiv \mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph) . \quad (18)$$

Equation (16) leads to a precise definition of renormalization for this system.

3. Effective renormalization framework

In the effective framework, the regularization of the system is defined in a manner consistent with two fundamental requirements, dictated by the physics of relevant realizations:

1. The *existence of bound states with finite energy*, set by the ultraviolet physics.
2. The restriction of the *conformal coupling to be fixed by the long-distance behavior*.

The relative simplicity of the conformal physics is due to its *scaling properties*, which permit a direct analysis based on the parameter κ associated with bound states (see Eq. (6)) and its *hierarchical comparison* with other relevant scales. Then, the condition $\kappa a \ll 1$ can be applied systematically—however, for $\kappa a \gtrsim 1$, no prediction can be made as “new” ultraviolet physics supersedes the conformal interaction. More precisely, consistent use of the condition $\kappa a \ll 1$, in Eq. (16) and related expressions, establishes the claim we made at the beginning of the previous section: the *effective theory* inherits predictability in the energy realm $|E| \ll \mathcal{E}_a$ and generates the *universal behavior* of the spherically symmetric long-range conformal interaction, *regardless of the details of the ultraviolet physics*.

In the conformally invariant domain, i.e., $\kappa a \ll 1$, Eq. (16) leads to the behavior

$$\alpha(\Theta, \kappa a) \stackrel{(\kappa a \ll 1)}{\sim} -\pi f_n = -\pi (n + f_0) , \quad (19)$$

where n is a positive integer, $f_n = n + f_0$, and f_0 a dimensionless constant of order one. The particular value of f_0 , which is sensitively dependent upon the details of the ultraviolet physics, is not relevant in the determination of the *universal conformal properties*. This can be seen from Eqs. (17) and (19), which lead to the bound-state energy spectrum

$$E_n = E_0 \exp \left(-\frac{2\pi n}{\Theta} \right) , \quad (20)$$

which is a geometric sequence with ratio

$$\eta = \exp \left(-\frac{2\pi}{\Theta} \right) , \quad (21)$$

starting from

$$E_0 = -\mathcal{E}_a (2e^{-\gamma_\Theta})^2 e^{-2\pi f_0/\Theta} . \quad (22)$$

This universal prediction of conformal quantum mechanics could be tested by considering

$$\epsilon_{n',n} \equiv \frac{E_{n'}}{E_n} = \eta^{n'-n} ; \quad (23)$$

these ratios depend on a single physical quantity: the *conformal parameter* Θ (through the exponential (21)). Even though f_0 and a still determine the precise value of E_0 , in this framework, the scale E_0 is either an observable to be adjusted experimentally or a quantity to be determined from additional ultraviolet-specific information. In short, the *conformal tower* of bound states (20) has the following attributes:

1. *Universality*: it is independent of ultraviolet and infrared alterations of the physics, for the subset of theories with *conformal coupling set by the long-distance behavior*.
2. *Geometric scaling*: characterized by the relative ratios (23), through the constant factor η of Eq. (21).
3. *Renormalized scaling*: the base value E_0 is an *adjustable parameter*.
4. *Boundedness from below*: due to the presence of additional ultraviolet physics.

Correspondingly, the quantity $\kappa_{n'}/\kappa_n = e^{-\pi(n'-n)/\Theta}$ provides the corresponding inverse ratio of spatial sizes of the associated wave functions, as a more detailed analysis of Eq. (6) shows. In a similar manner, Eq. (5) can be used to analyze the scattering sector of the theory, in which the S matrix also reproduces the spectrum (20) from its pole structure.

The most remarkable property of the renormalized conformal system is its attendant geometric scaling. In essence, it describes the *residual discrete scale invariance* (under a discrete subgroup of scalings), which is left over after the symmetry breaking inherent in the renormalization process:

$$\epsilon_{n'+m, n+m} = \epsilon_{n', n} \quad (24)$$

(for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$) and states that $E_{n'}/E_n = E_{n'-n}/E_0$. Reciprocally, the remnant symmetry (24) completely characterizes the spectrum: its iterative use as a recursion relation implies a geometric bound-state tower with $E_n = E_0 \eta^n$, in which the scaling factor (21) is determined by comparison with the conformal interaction. As a result, the spectrum looks identical from any “vantage point,” provided that an appropriate proportional rescaling is simultaneously enforced. Mathematically, the spectrum is invariant under all discrete magnifications $\eta^q = E_2/E_1$ (with $q \in \mathbb{Z}$) accompanied by a simultaneous shift of “vantage point”: $E_1 \rightarrow E_2$.

In practice, the conformal tower is usually limited in the infrared and experimental detection of multiple bound states may prove difficult to achieve. The only crucial requirement

for the applicability of the effective framework is the existence of a conformally-invariant domain that sets in around an ultraviolet scale $L_{UV} \sim a$, and possibly limited by an infrared cutoff $L_{IR} \gg L_{UV}$. In particular, when the phenomenological parameters L_{UV} and L_{IR} are finite, the number N_{conf} of conformal bound states is also finite and can be derived with $n \sim N_{\text{conf}}$ as an ordinal number, through inversion of Eq. (20); thus,

$$N_{\text{conf}} \sim \frac{\Theta}{\pi} \ln \left(\frac{L_{IR}}{L_{UV}} \right), \quad (25)$$

which is in agreement with standard upper bounds for the number of bound states [17]. Moreover, such bounds enhance the predictability of the conformal approach by quantifying corrections associated with the existence of an infrared cutoff, as shown in Ref. [18]—where these techniques are applied to the formation of molecular dipole-bound anions.

4. Intrinsic and core renormalization frameworks

Next, we summarize the implementation of alternative renormalization frameworks in which the limit $\xi = \kappa a \rightarrow 0$ is applied under the following conditions:

- (a) κ is to be fixed by the finite value of the corresponding bound-state energy.
- (b) One of the coupling parameters (either λ or $\aleph$) should accordingly run with respect to a , to guarantee that Eq. (16) be satisfied.

In the ***intrinsic renormalization framework***, the *conformal coupling* λ is promoted to a *running parameter*, so that $\Theta = \Theta(a)$, while the strength $\aleph$ of the regularizing core interaction is kept constant. When this limit is enforced, the expression $\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph)/\Theta$ on the right-hand side of Eq. (16) takes a definite value; thus, the corresponding left-hand side yields a particular value of the function $\alpha(\Theta, \kappa a)$; by consistency with Eq. (17), this implies the condition

$$\Theta(a) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \lambda(a) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} \lambda^{(*)} \quad (26)$$

for the running of the coupling towards its critical value. Furthermore, Eq. (21) implies the *formal infrared collapse of the bound-state spectrum*: if the ground-state energy is fixed, the conformal tower of excited states is pushed towards its *accumulation point* $E = 0$; however, an effective reinterpretation should still lead to the familiar sequence (20).

In addition to the running coupling (26), an *effective boundary condition* can be derived

from Eq. (11), if one assumes the continuous matching

$$V^{(<)}(\mathbf{r})|_{r=a} = V^{(>)}(\mathbf{r})|_{r=a} .$$

Then, as $a \rightarrow 0$ and defining the variables $\tilde{\xi} = \tilde{k}a$ and $\xi = \kappa a$, with fixed κ , the nature of the limit

$$\tilde{\xi} \equiv \tilde{k}a = \sqrt{\aleph - \xi^2} \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} \sqrt{\aleph} \geq \sqrt{\lambda^{(*)} + \Theta^2} \quad (27)$$

depends on whether $\lambda^{(*)}$ vanishes or not. Here, the matching condition $\aleph \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r})|_{r=a} = \lambda$ was used, so that $\aleph \geq \lambda$. The two ensuing scenarios ($\lambda^{(*)} \neq 0$ and $\lambda^{(*)} = 0$) are discussed next.

For $d \neq 2$ or $l \neq 0$: $\lambda^{(*)} \neq 0$ and Eq. (27) gives

$$\tilde{\xi} \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} \sqrt{\aleph} \geq \sqrt{\lambda^{(*)}} > 0 ;$$

this implies that $\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\tilde{\xi}; \tilde{k}) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} \mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph)$ takes a finite and nonzero value—for example, for a constant regularizing core [10], the reduced wave function $w_{l+\nu}(\tilde{k}r; \tilde{k}) \propto J_{l+\nu}(\tilde{k}r)$ satisfies this condition, as $J'_{l+\nu}(l+\nu) \neq 0$. Correspondingly, in Eq. (16), $|\cot \alpha| \rightarrow \infty$, so that

$$\sin \alpha(\Theta, \kappa a) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} 0 , \quad (28)$$

$$u(r=a) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} 0 , \quad (29)$$

with $u(r) = \sqrt{r} v(r)$ being the usual reduced wave function (cf. Eq. (13)). Thus, this framework is compatible with the choice of a Dirichlet boundary condition at the shifted position $r = a$. In fact, Eq. (29) provides the starting point for the alternative renormalization framework advanced in Refs. [19, 20]—and also used in path integral treatments of conformal quantum mechanics [21]. However, the more general approach presented in this Letter sheds light on the emergence of this *effective boundary condition*.

For $d = 2$ and $l = 0$: $\lambda^{(*)} = 0$ and

$$\tilde{\xi} = \tilde{k}a \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} \sqrt{\aleph} \geq \sqrt{\lambda} = O(\Theta) ,$$

which suggests that Eq. (16) acquires a different limit, $\cot \alpha \rightarrow 0$, at least for a constant core. The *effective boundary condition* becomes

$$\cos \alpha(\Theta, \kappa a) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} 0 . \quad (30)$$

Even though this has the appearance of a Neumann boundary condition, Eq. (29) is still satisfied due to the prefactor $\sqrt{r}$.

The intrinsic framework is reminiscent of the renormalization theory that predated the effective field theory program [9], with a running coupling leading to the renormalization-group β function, defined from $\beta(\Theta) \equiv \Lambda \partial\Theta(\Lambda)/\partial\Lambda$ (with $\Lambda = 1/a$), so that

$$\beta(\Theta) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} -\frac{1}{\pi f_n} \Theta^2, \quad (31)$$

which should be limited to the ground state ($n = 0$). Once the general properties of this framework are understood through a unified real-space approach, one can consider alternative regularization schemes within this traditional paradigm and further examine the running behavior of the coupling constant (as in the QED realizations of Section 5).

Finally, in the **core renormalization framework**, the strength $\aleph$ of the regularizing core is promoted to a running coupling $\aleph = \aleph(a)$, while the *conformal coupling* λ remains *fixed* [22, 23]. In this framework, our unified description leads to

$$\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph(a)) \stackrel{(a \rightarrow 0)}{\sim} \varpi(a) \equiv \Theta \cot[\alpha(\Theta, \kappa a)] , \quad (32)$$

while the rapidly oscillating *conformal* behavior of Eq. (17) provides the characteristic log-periodic running coupling $\aleph(a)$ of the core—the celebrated *limit cycle* for the renormalization group of the three-body problem [22, 23, 24]. For $d = 3$, $l = 0$, and zero energy,

$$\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph(a)) = \sqrt{\aleph(a)} \cot \sqrt{\aleph(a)} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (33)$$

whose form is also valid for $E \neq 0$ with the replacement $\sqrt{\aleph} \rightarrow \tilde{k}a$. In the three-body problem, a delta-function counterterm is usually modeled with a square well: $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{r}) = \text{const}$ (for $0 \leq r < a$). Most importantly, our derivation is *robust* and completely general—valid for any core $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r})$, dimensionality, and angular momentum. For example, for a flat core in $d \neq 3$ or $l \neq 0$, the function (33) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}^{(<)}(\aleph(a)) = \left. \frac{\tilde{\xi} J'_{l+\nu}(\tilde{\xi})}{J_{l+\nu}(\tilde{\xi})} \right|_{\tilde{\xi}=\tilde{k}a}.$$

In short, the main and critical difference between the intrinsic and core frameworks consists in the *treatment of the conformal coupling*:

- For a running conformal coupling dictated by self-consistency requirements of the conformal interaction: the intrinsic framework applies.

- For a fixed conformal coupling dictated by the long-distance physics: the core framework is mandatory.

In the intrinsic framework, a single symmetry-breaking bound states survives, as discussed in Refs. [3, 20]. By contrast, from the treatment of the conformal coupling as a fixed variable, *the conformal physics—including symmetry breaking—of the core framework reduces to that of the effective framework and displays the **residual symmetry**, of the strong-coupling regime and its associated geometric scaling.*

5. Physical realizations

The renormalization frameworks presented in this Letter provide a unified approach for a broad set of physical realizations.

5.1. Near-horizon physics and the thermodynamics of black holes

The primary properties of black hole thermodynamics can be derived within a semiclassical approach in which the quantum fields encode the quantum properties of a black hole [25]. The ensuing physics in generalized Schwarzschild coordinates is conformally invariant near the horizon [26, 27]; this can be shown by considering a scalar field Φ described by the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} [g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \Phi \nabla_\nu \Phi + m^2 \Phi^2 + \xi R \Phi^2]$$

(with mass m and coupling ξ to the curvature scalar R) in a class of metrics in D spacetime dimensions,

$$ds^2 = -f(r) dt^2 + [f(r)]^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega_{(D-2)}^2 ,$$

including the Schwarzschild and Reissner-Nordström geometries [28]. In this approach, a hierarchical expansion in the radial variable $x = r - r_+$, away from the outer horizon r_+ , leads to a *one-dimensional near-horizon strong-coupling conformal interaction* $V(x) \sim -\lambda/x^2$, in which $\lambda = \Theta^2 + 1/4$ with *conformal parameter*

$$\Theta = \frac{\omega}{f'_+} \tag{34}$$

(for a frequency component ω) and $f'_+ = f'(r_+)$. The corresponding density of states—an appropriate generalization of the conformal density of states derived from Eq. (25)—experiences an “*ultraviolet catastrophe*” and requires a *geometric renormalization* equivalent to an effective “brick wall” near the Planck scale [25]. In essence, this procedure amounts to the presence of an ultraviolet cutoff L_{UV} for the conformal potential (with a scale of the order of r_+ leading to an infrared cutoff L_{IR}). Thus, the existence of a conformal domain completely drives the thermodynamics, with the Hawking temperature T_H uniquely given by the conformal parameter,

$$T_H = \frac{f'_+}{4\pi} = \frac{\omega}{4\pi\Theta} ; \quad (35)$$

this suggests a conformal derivation of the Hawking effect, as we will discuss elsewhere.

5.2. Molecular dipole-bound anions

These systems, formed by the interaction of an electron with a polar molecule, possess a conformally invariant domain, with an anisotropic generalization of Eq. (4):

$$\mathcal{V}^{(>)}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\lambda \cos \theta}{r^2} .$$

Here, a large body of experimental and computational evidence shows the *existence of a critical dipole moment*, in agreement with the conformal prediction [12]. The effective *conformal parameter*

$$\Theta = \sqrt{\gamma - \frac{1}{4}} \quad (36)$$

is related to the dimensionless molecular dipole moment λ through the roots of an angular secular equation $D(\gamma, \lambda) = 0$ involving multiple angular momentum channels:

$$D(\gamma, \lambda) = \det \left[(\hat{L}/\hbar)^2 + \gamma \mathbb{1} - \lambda \cos \theta \right]$$

(with $\hat{L}$ being the angular momentum and $\mathbb{1}$ the identity operator), in which the matrix elements are evaluated in the angular momentum basis $|l, m\rangle$. This problem gives a conformal critical dipole moment $\lambda_{\text{conf}}^{(*)} \approx 1.279$ (corresponding to 1.625 D, in debye units) dictated by the conformal critical point $\gamma^{(*)} = 1/4$. In addition, the conformal behavior is limited by an ultraviolet boundary $L_{\text{UV}} \sim a$ of the order of the molecular size a and an infrared scale L_{IR} due to the coupling with rotational molecular degrees of freedom [29]:

$$L_{\text{IR}} = r_B \equiv \sqrt{\hbar^2 / (2m_e B)} \gg a \sim L_{\text{UV}} ,$$

where $B = \hbar^2/2I$ is the rotator constant, $I \sim Ma^2$ is the moment of inertia, m_e the electron mass, and M is the mass of the molecule.

Incidentally, it should be noticed that an alternative viewpoint for molecular dipole-bound anions was presented in Ref. [30], within an approach centered on the rotational degrees of freedom and governed by an effective adiabatic inverse fourth potential. This alternative treatment, however, fails to account for the existence of a critical dipole moment and otherwise does not add any new ingredients to the physics of electron binding by polar molecules. The incompleteness of the proposal of Ref. [30] is in sharp contrast with the conformal approach: as shown in Ref. [18], the physical origin of criticality and the physics of the logarithmic corrections to the critical dipole moment are traced directly to the presence of a conformal window of scales and its associated renormalization—with the rotational dynamics merely setting the infrared scale. Thus, using the parameters L_{UV} and L_{IR} , a systematic approximation scheme can be introduced to account for the effects of the rotational degrees of freedom—for example, the critical dipole moment $\lambda^{(*)} = \lambda_{\text{conf}}^{(*)} (1 + \epsilon)$ can be computed from

$$\epsilon \approx \frac{80 \pi^2 (1 - \delta)^2}{9 [\ln(r_B/a)^2]^2}$$

(in which δ absorbs ultraviolet and infrared corrections), with remarkable numerical accuracy [18].

5.3. *The many-body Efimov effect*

This phenomenon, which consists in the formation of spatially extended bound states in a three-body system [31], has been recently highlighted for the three-body nucleon interaction [24]. Specifically, the internal dynamics of the three-body system in three dimensions involves 6 degrees of freedom; a hyperspherical adiabatic expansion [32] and a Faddeev decomposition of the wave function [33] lead to the Efimov effect for the ensuing adiabatic potentials [34]: the formation of spatially extended and weakly bound states, with an accumulation point at zero energy. This is just the *conformal tower* of bound states, which can be established through the reduction process leading to a 6-dimensional realization of the conformal interaction (4); then, Eq. (8) for $l = 0$ implies that $\lambda^{(*)} = 4$, so that $\lambda = 4 + \Theta^2$ and the *conformal parameter* Θ only depends upon the three ratios of particle masses (for large

scattering lengths)—which, for typical physical parameters, yields a problem in the strong-coupling regime. For example, for identical bosons with zero-range two-particle interactions, the corresponding transcendental equation

$$8 \sinh \left(\frac{\pi \Theta}{6} \right) = \sqrt{3} \Theta \cosh \left(\frac{\pi \Theta}{2} \right) \quad (37)$$

provides the value $\Theta \approx 1.006$.

Thus, the number N_E of Efimov bound states is approximately given by Eq. (25), with the infrared cutoff $L_{\text{IR}} \sim l_{\text{sc}}$ (average two-body scattering length) and the ultraviolet cutoff $L_{\text{UV}} \sim a \sim R_e$ (effective range of the interaction). The Efimov effect—being a characteristic three-body phenomenon—has also been applied to the description of the atomic helium trimer ${}^4\text{He}_3$ and to other atomic and molecular combinations [34, 35].

5.4. *Quantum electrodynamics (QED)*

Several regimes of QED_D (in $D = d + 1$ spacetime dimensions) reduce to conformal quantum mechanics and confirm that chiral symmetry breaking occurs for sufficiently large couplings. A typical reduction scheme is based on the linearization of the Euclidean Schwinger-Dyson equation for the fermion self-energy, followed by a real-space reinterpretation in terms of an effective Schrödinger equation (5) with $l = 0$, within the ladder approximation [36, 37, 38]; the existence of bound states in the effective problem is equivalent to *dynamical chiral symmetry breaking* for QED_D . The first relevant *conformal regime* is that of QED_3 with N_f Dirac-fermion flavors [36], for intermediate distances, with *conformal parameter* (in three dimensions)

$$\Theta = \sqrt{\frac{32}{3\pi^2 N_f} - \frac{1}{4}};$$

thus, there exists a *critical fermion number*

$$N^{(*)} = \frac{128}{3\pi^2} \approx 4.323$$

for the appearance of the symmetry-breaking tower of conformal states (20)—in agreement with Refs. [36] and [39]. Another *conformal regime* is that of quenched QED_4 , with *conformal coupling* $\lambda = 3\alpha/\pi$, proportional to the QED fine structure constant $\alpha = e^2/(4\pi\hbar c)$; the *conformal parameter* is

$$\Theta = \sqrt{\frac{3\alpha}{\pi} - 1} \quad (38)$$

(as Eq. (8) gives $\lambda^{(*)} = 1$ in four dimensions), which implies a *critical QED₄ coupling* $\alpha^{(*)} = \pi/3$ for the occurrence of chiral symmetry breaking [37]; by contrast, in lower dimensionalities, QED_D does not show criticality: symmetry breaking always occurs because a nonconformal attractive regular potential is involved. Finally, the running of the effective conformal coupling in quenched QED₄ can also be described within the *intrinsic renormalization framework* using dimensional regularization [3, 37]: $(\alpha - \alpha^{(*)})/\alpha^{(*)} \propto \epsilon^{2/3}$, with $\epsilon = (4 - D)/2$.

6. Conclusions

Renormalization of a conformally invariant interaction is mandatory when the ultraviolet physics of the associated singular problem dictates the existence of bound states. In this Letter, we have introduced a generic regularization approach in real space and displayed the advantages of the effective renormalization framework. In conformal quantum mechanics, this procedure leads to an *anomaly or quantum symmetry breaking* in the strong-coupling regime [11, 40, 41]—a process that is induced by the need to regularize the theory with a symmetry-breaking dimensional parameter [3] and is manifested by anomalous terms in the SO(2,1) algebra within all renormalization frameworks [11]. The central properties of near-horizon black-hole thermodynamics, the formation of dipole-bound anions, the many-body Efimov effect, and various regimes of quantum electrodynamics—among other systems—constitute an expanding set of effective realizations of this conformal anomaly. In closing, we emphasize the generality of the techniques introduced in this Letter, which could also be applied to other singular interactions, to the Calogero model [42], and possibly to other instances of conformal behavior and dynamical symmetry breaking in gauge theories.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0308300 (H.E.C.) and under Grant No. 0308435 (C.R.O.), and by the University of San Francisco Faculty Development Fund (H.E.C.). We also thank Dr. Stanley Nel for generous travel support; Professors Cliff Burgess, Luis N. Epele, Huner Fanchiotti, and Carlos A. García Canal for discussions leading to this work; and Dr. Valery P. Gusynin for bringing important

references to our attention.

- [1] R. Jackiw, *Phys. Today* 25 (1) (1972) 23.
- [2] V. de Alfaro, S. Fubini, and G. Furlan, *Nuovo Cimento A* 34 (1976) 569.
- [3] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, and C. A. García Canal, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* 287 (2001) 14; H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, and C. A. García Canal, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* 287 (2001) 57.
- [4] R. Jackiw, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* 129 (1980) 183; R. Jackiw, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* 201 (1990) 83.
- [5] R. Jackiw, in: *M. A. B. Bég Memorial Volume*, A. Ali and P. Hoodbhoy (Eds.), World Scientific, Singapore, 1991.
- [6] K. Huang, *Quarks, Leptons, and Gauge Fields*, second ed., World Scientific, Singapore, 1992, Sections 10.7 and 10.8.
- [7] C. Manuel and R. Tarrach, *Phys. Lett. B* 268 (1991) 222; 301 (1993) 72.
- [8] S. K. Adhikari and T. Frederico, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74 (1995) 4572; S. K. Adhikari and A. Ghosh, *J. Phys. A* 30 (1997) 6553.
- [9] K. G. Wilson, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 47 (1975) 773; J. Polchinski, *Nucl. Phys. B* 231 (1984) 269; J. Polchinski, hep-th/9210046.
- [10] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics*, third ed., Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1977, pp. 114–117.
- [11] H. E. Camblong and C. R. Ordóñez, *Phys. Rev. D* 68 (2003) 125013.
- [12] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, and C. A. García Canal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87 (2001) 220402; and references therein.
- [13] A. Erdélyi and the Staff of the Bateman Manuscript Project (Eds.), *Higher Transcendental Functions*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953, Volume II, Chapter XI.
- [14] A. Erdélyi and the Staff of the Bateman Manuscript Project (Eds.), *Higher Transcendental Functions*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953, Volume II, Chapter VII.
- [15] K. M. Case, *Phys. Rev.* 80 (1950) 797.
- [16] P. M. Morse and H. Feshbach, *Methods of Theoretical Physics*, Volume 2, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953, pp. 1665–1667.
- [17] F. Calogero, *Variable Phase Approach to Potential Scattering*, Academic Press, New York,

- 1967.
- [18] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, C. A. García Canal, and C. R. Ordóñez, hep-th/0501193, Phys. Rev. A, in press.
 - [19] K. S. Gupta and S. G. Rajeev, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 5940.
 - [20] H. E. Camblong, L. N. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, and C. A. García Canal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000) 1590.
 - [21] H. E. Camblong and C. R. Ordóñez, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 17 (2002) 817; H. E. Camblong and C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. A 65 (2002) 052123; H. E. Camblong and C. R. Ordóñez, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 19 (2004) 1413.
 - [22] S. R. Beane, P. F. Bedaque, L. Childress, A. Kryjevski, J. McGuire, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. A 64 (2001) 042103.
 - [23] M. Bawin and S. A. Coon, Phys. Rev. A 67 (2003) 042712.
 - [24] P. F. Bedaque, H.-W. Hammer, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 463; P. F. Bedaque, H.-W. Hammer, and U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. A 646 (1999) 444.
 - [25] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. B 256 (1985) 727.
 - [26] S. Carlip, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 2828; S. Carlip, Class. Quantum Grav. 16 (1999) 3327; S. Carlip, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2002) 241301.
 - [27] S. N. Solodukhin, Phys. Lett. B 454 (1999) 213; D. Birmingham, K. S. Gupta, and S. Sen, Phys. Lett. B 505 (2001) 191; K. S. Gupta and S. Sen, Phys. Lett. B 526 (2002) 121.
 - [28] H. E. Camblong and C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 104029; H. E. Camblong and C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 124040.
 - [29] W. R. Garrett, Phys. Rev. A 22 (1980) 1769.
 - [30] M. Bawin, Phys. Rev. A 70 (2004) 022505.
 - [31] V. Efimov, Phys. Lett. B 33 (1970) 563; V. Efimov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 12 (1971) 589; V. Efimov, Comments Nucl. Part. Phys. 19 (1990) 271.
 - [32] J. Macek, J. Phys. B 1 (1968) 831.
 - [33] L. D. Faddeev, Sov. Phys. JETP 12 (1961) 1014.
 - [34] E. Nielsen, D. V. Fedorov, A. S. Jensen, and E. Garrido, Phys. Rep. 347 (2001) 373.
 - [35] E. Nielsen, D. V. Fedorov, and A. S. Jensen, J. Phys. B 31 (1998) 4085; E. Braaten, H.-W. Hammer, and M. Kusunoki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 170402.
 - [36] V. P. Gusynin, A. H. Hams, and M. Reenders, Phys. Rev. D 53 (1996) 2227.

- [37] V. P. Gusynin, A. W. Schreiber, T. Sizer, and A. G. Williams, Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999) 065007.
- [38] P. I. Fomin, V. P. Gusynin, and V. A. Miransky, Phys. Lett. B 78 (1978) 136; V. A. Miransky, Dynamical Symmetry Breaking in Quantum Field Theory, World Scientific, Singapore, 1993.
- [39] D. Nash, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62 (1989) 997.
- [40] G. N. J. Añaños, H. E. Camblong, C. Gorrichátegui, E. Hernández, and C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 045018; G. N. J. Añaños, H. E. Camblong, and C. R. Ordóñez, Phys. Rev. D 68 (2003) 025006.
- [41] J. G. Esteve, Phys. Rev. D 66 (2002) 125013.
- [42] B. Basu-Mallick and K. S. Gupta, Phys. Lett. A 292 (2001) 36; B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh, and K. S. Gupta, Nucl. Phys. B 659 (2003) 437; B. Basu-Mallick, P. K. Ghosh, and K. S. Gupta, Phys. Lett. A 311 (2003) 87.